

REMARKS

Claims 1-21, 24-44, 46-49 and 53-55 are now pending in this application.
Reconsideration of the application is earnestly requested.

The Office action has finally rejected claims 1-14, 16-21, 32, 34-37, 42-44, 47-49 and 53-55 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chim et al.* (*Chim*) in view of *Alexander et al.* (*Alexander*). Although the Examiner's arguments have been carefully considered, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Chim teaches "a camera tracking system that continuously tracks sound emitting objects...a sound activation feature of the system enables a video camera to track speakers in a manner similar to the natural transition that occurs when people turn they eyes toward different sounds..."(Abstract). Clearly, Chim relies solely upon sound generated by a speaker in order to provide appropriate tracking commands to the video camera. This fact is stated throughout Chim time and again. For example, at column 6 starting at line 6, " the tracking system 10 of the present invention enables the video camera 10 to track each sound emitting object such as speaker 20 or a number of speaking participants of the conference in a manner substantially similar to the natural transition that occurs when people turn their eyes toward different persons...". Also note Fig. 3 below clearly illustrating how it is only microphone input at step 44 that is used to evaluate whether or not a positional change has occurred at step 48. In this way, the system taught by Chim provides for automatic camera tracking based *solely* upon the sound emanated from a speaker (or other sound source) and nothing else. As a matter of fact, Chim does not discriminate at all between the speaker 20 (shown in Fig. 2A below) and any other source of sound. Therefore, since Chim does not discriminate between speaker 20 and any other sound source, using the system taught by Chim in a videoconference, for example, has the potential for the video camera to erroneously track to sound sources such as a ringing phone, a door closing, or other extraneous sound sources unrelated to speaker 20. In these situations, the only way for speaker 20 to regain the "spotlight" (so to speak) would be to raise their voice over the extraneous sounds as Chim provides no other way of redirecting the video camera to the desired area of interest.

In contrast, claim 1 provides for a user to direct the video camera to automatically focus an *any* area of interest whether or not that area of interest has any sound originating therefrom. The only criteria that defines an area of interest in the context of the invention is that provided by

a user that may, in fact, have nothing whatsoever to do with any sounds being emanated therefrom. In this way (in contrast to Chim) an area of interest can be silent with no sound at all and still have the video camera automatically focus thereon.

In particular, claim 1 recites in part

a camera operatively connected to said processor, said camera arranged to capture video input in accordance with its field of view, and said camera arranged to automatically focus on a determined region of the field of view without moving the camera, *the determined region being determined in accordance with a user input*;

In this way, the inventive system can be under the control of a user regardless of the number and extent of any sound sources within audio range of the electronic device. Chim, on the other hand, must have a sound source in order for the video camera to properly track. Accordingly, the Applicants believe that claim 1 is not rendered obvious by any combination of Chim and Alexander.

With regards to the rejection of claim 2, the Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's contention that Chim discloses specifying a user-specified region of interest by a user through interaction with a graphical user interface. The Applicants have thoroughly reviewed Chim and have failed to find any reference to a graphical user interface let alone one that would allow a user to specify a region of interest that supercedes and overrides the audio tracking of speaker 20 or other sound emanating source so repeatedly discussed in Chim. Therefore, the Applicants believe that claim 2 is also not rendered obvious by Chim or Alexander or any combination thereof.

All independent claims recite substantially the same limitations as claim 1 and are therefore also believed to be allowable as are all dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration of this application and issuance of a Notice of Allowance at an early date are respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would in any way expedite prosecution, please do not hesitate to telephone the undersigned at (408) 255-8001.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER LAW GROUP LLP

/Michael J Ferrazano/
Michael J. Ferrazano
Registration No. 44,105

BEYER LAW GROUP LLP
P.O. Box 1687
Cupertino, CA 95015-1687